

PATENT 8733.004.01

Group Art Unit: 287

Examiner: T. Chowdhury

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re application of

Yong Beom KIM

Application No.: 08/936,510

Filed: September 24, 1997

For: REFLECTIVE TYPE LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE AND

METHOD FOR MAKING THE SAME

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Commissioner of Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Non-Final Office Action dated June 25, 2002, the following amendments and remarks are respectfully submitted.

IN THE CLAIMS

Please CANCEL claims 8, 11, 17-19, 29, 30, 31, and 37-39 without prejudice.

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of June 25, 2002 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this amendment, Applicant cancels claims 8, 11, 17-19, 29, 30, 31, and 37-39 without prejudice, claims 1, 4, 14, 16, 20, and 21 remain pending. Reexamination and

SEP 26 2007

Application No.: 08/936,510 Docket No.: 8733.004.01

Group Art Unit: 2871

Page 2

reconsideration of the application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated June 25, 2002, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mitsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,559,617); and rejected claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16-21, 29-31, and 37-39 as being unpatentable over Clerc et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,813,770) in view of Sugiyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,757,455), Toko (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,459), and Kanbe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,500,750). The aforementioned rejections are traversed and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mitsui et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "two uniaxial optical compensation films of a same type over the second substrate." The cited references including Mitsui et al., either singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 3 and 4, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner cites <u>Mitsui et al.</u> as showing "two optical compensation films (13,14) of a same type over the second substrate (3)." Applicant respectfully submits, however, that <u>Mitsui et al.</u> does not show at least the elements as recited above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by <u>Mitsui et al.</u>, as applied above.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16-21, 29-31, and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Clerc et al.</u> in view of <u>Sugiyama et al.</u>, <u>Toko</u>, and <u>Kanbe et al.</u> is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Application No.: 08/936,510 Docket No.: 8733.004.01

(

Group Art Unit: 2871

Page 3

Claims 1, 8, 14, and 29 are allowable over the cited references in that claims 1, 8, 14, and 29 recite a combination of elements including, for example, "two uniaxial optical compensation films of a same type over the second substrate." None of the cited references, including Clerc et al., Sugiyama et al., Toko, or Kanbe, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8, 14, and 29 and claims 4, 9 and 11, 16-21, 30-31 and 37-39, which depend from claims 1, 8, 14, and 29, are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner cites <u>Clerc et al.</u> as showing "two uniaxial optical compensation films (54,52) of a same type over the second substrate (6)." Applicant respectfully submits, however, that <u>Clerc et al.</u> does not show or suggest at least the elements as recited above. For example, Applicant respectfully submits <u>Clerc et al.</u> teaches at column 10, lines 53-55 "Polarizer 46 is constituted by ... with a quarter waver plate 52 formed in a positive optical anisotropy uniaxial medium or material" and at column 10, line 63 - column 11, line 3 "The cell shown in FIG. 9 also comprises at least one sheet of a uniaxial material of negative optical anisotropy... In the case of FIG. 9, the cell has two such sheets, 54 and 56..., sheet 54 being positioned between plate 8 and polarizer 46 and sheet 56 between plate 14 and polarizer 48."

The Examiner additionally cites <u>Clerc et al.</u> as disclosing in column 11, lines 8-17 "that the use of one or more (emphasis added) sheets of negative optical anisotropy uniaxial material in the cell of Fig. 9 provides better light efficiency." The Examiner then concludes "it would have been obvious... to use two uniaxial compensation films of a same type [so] that light efficiency is improved." Again, Applicant respectfully submits that <u>Clerc et al.</u> does not show or suggest at least the elements as recited above. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that at column 11, lines 4-17, <u>Clerc et al.</u> teaches "The optimum

Application No.: 08/936,510

Group Art Unit: 2871

Docket No.: 8733.004.01

Page 4

thickness ... of the single plate 54 or 56 ... is determined as a function of the total thickness of the liquid crystal. The use of one or more sheets of negative optical anisotropy uniaxial

material in the cell of FIG. 9 makes it possible to separately control the almost circular

ellipticity in the entire visible range of the wave passing through the liquid crystal layers

(which leads to a better light efficiency in the white state of the cell)..."

invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

By

Respectfully submitted,

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP

Date: September 25, 2002

Song K. Jung

Registration No: 33,210

1900 K STREET, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500

Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756

30827

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE